

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Official Action dated December 13, 2004 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1-14 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Initially, the Applicants wish to thank Examiner Gravini for taking the time to speak with the Applicant's representative on January 25, 2005. During the telephonic Interview, the pending claims and the cited references were discussed.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,840 (hereinafter "*Chbat*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As noted above, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a laundry dryer which includes a microcomputer for controlling a plurality of drivers wherein an "exhaust fan driver operates during the cooling procedure such that the dryer operates during the cooling procedure." As agreed to by the Examiner during the Interview, *Chbat* does not disclose this feature. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that *Chbat* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 1, as required under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable over *Chbat* for at least the same reason.

The Office Action also rejected claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,245,764 to *Sung* (hereinafter "*Sung*"). The rejection is traversed. As illustrated above, the Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite a method of controlling a laundry dryer comprising, among other features, "comparing the sensed internal temperature with a predetermined set temperature value." As agreed to by Examiner Gravini during the Interview, *Sung* does teach this element. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully

submits that *Sung* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 9 and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claim 11, which depends from claim 9, is also patentable over *Sung* for at least the same reason.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chbat* in view of *Sung*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Chbat* nor *Sung*, either singularly or in combination, disclose each and every element recited in claims 3-8. As discussed above, *Chbat* does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claims 3-8 depend. Furthermore, *Sung* fails to overcome the previously noted shortcomings of *Chbat*. Thus, neither *Chbat* nor *Sung*, either singularly or in combination, disclose each and every element recited in claims 3-8. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 3-8 are patentable over *Chbat* in view of *Sung* and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Furthermore, the Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sung*. As previously discussed, *Sung* does not disclose each and every feature recited in claim 9, from which claim 10 depends. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 10 is also patentable over *Sung* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sung* in view of *Chbat*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As detailed above, *Sung* does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 9, from which claims 12-14 depend. Similarly, *Chbat* does not address the previously discussed shortcomings of *Sung*. Therefore, neither *Sung* nor *Chbat*, either singularly or in combination, disclose each

and every element recited in claims 12-14 and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicant believes that the application is in a condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant